Bonneville Power Administration
Fish and Wildlife Program FY98 Watershed Proposal Form

Section 1. General administrative information

Title # GRANDE RONDE MODEL WATERSHED HABITAT PROJECTS

Bonneville project number, if an ongoing project 9402700

Business name of agency, institution or organization requesting funding
Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program (Blue Mtns.) : Union County, Wallowa County

Business acronym (if appropriate) GRMWP

Proposal contact person or principal investigator:

Name	Patty Perry
Mailing Address	10901 Island Ave
City, ST Zip	La Grande, OR 97850
Phone	541-962-6590
Fax	541-962-6593
Email address	perryp@eou.edu

Subcontractors.

Organization	Mailing Address	City, ST Zip	Contact Name
Union SWCD	10507 N. Mc Alister	La Grande, OR 97850	Sarah Hendrickson
Wallowa SWCD	Federal Bldg - 109 201 W North St.	Enterprise, OR 97828	Cynthia Warnock
Wallowa County	101 S. River	Enterprise, OR 97828	
Union County	1106 "K' Ave	La Grande, Or 97850	
Umatilla National Forest	2517 SW Hailey Ave.	Pendleton, OR 97801	Caty Clifton
Umatilla National Forest, Walla Walla Ranger District	1415 W Rose St.	Walla Walla, WA 99362	Steve Anderson

Wallowa Whitman National Forest La Grande Ranger District	3502 Hwy 30	La Grande, OR 97850	Paul Boehne
Wallowa Whitman National Forest Wallowa Valley Ranger District	88401 Hwy 82	Enterprise, OR 97828	Kevin Martin
Union County Public Works	10513 N McAlister	La Grande, OR 97850	Rich Comstock
Wallowa County Public Works	P.O. Box 219	Enterprise, OR 97828	Randy Strohm

NPPC Program Measure Number(s) which this project addresses.

7.0 (7.6D, 7.7B.3, 7.8A.2, 7.8 A.5)

NMFS Biological Opinion Number(s) which this project addresses.

NA

Other planning document references.

National Marine Fisheries Service Snake River Salmon Recovery Plan (NMFS 1995, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, National Oceanic & Atmospheric Admin., Washington DC), Tasks 1.1.b, 1.4.b, 1.4.d, 1.5.b, and 1.6.b.
Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program , Sections 7.6D, 7.7

Stream and Riparian Conditions in the Grande Ronde Basin 1993, Section 9.2.2

Grande Ronde Model Watershed Operations-Action Plan, Appendix A &B

Wallowa County - Nez Perce Tribe Salmon Recovery Plan

Grande Ronde Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment Project (Mobrand, 1997)

Wallowa Whitman National Forest Plan

Subbasin.

Grande Ronde

Short description.

Develop and implement projects which will restore proper watershed functions in the Grande Ronde Basin. Provide the required spawning, rearing and migration habitat for endangered salmonids.

Section 2. Key words

Mar	Programmatic Categories	Mark	Activities	Mark	Project Types
X	Anadromous fish	X	Construction	X	Watershed
	Resident fish		O & M		Biodiversity/genetics
	Wildlife		Production		Population dynamics
	Oceans/estuaries		Research	+	Ecosystems
	Climate		Monitoring/eval.	+	Flow/survival
	Other	+	Resource mgmt		Fish disease
			Planning/admin.		Supplementation
			Enforcement	+	Wildlife habitat en-
			Acquisitions		hancement/restoration

Other keywords.

Section 3. Relationships to other Bonneville projects

Project #	Project title/description	Nature of relationship
		Project coordinates, plans, and implements habitat restoration in T&E chinook and steelhead streams. Project builds community-wide participation in watershed restoration among the diverse interests of the Grande Ronde basin; developing innovative ideas in watershed planning. Project plans seminars for stakeholders and facilitates interagency cooperation in habitat restoration.
9403000	**RASP in Grande Ronde basin**	**Grande Ronde Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment Project provides a science-based planning process that incorporates local values and objectives. The project uses a patient-template analysis, with chinook as the diagnostic species, to analyze**

		watershed conditions, identify restoration alternatives, analyze and prioritize restoration alternatives, and implement selected actions.
8402500	**Joseph Creek, Grand Ronde River, Oregon(ODFW)**	**Involves partnership efforts with Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife. ODFW representatives serve on the model watershed technical committee and the Board of Directors. Representatives are an integral part of project planning and development. The GRMWP uses ODFW expertise in the Grande Ronde Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment Project. Working together in restoration efforts has enhanced opportunities for both groups.**
9403900	**Wallowa Basin Project**	**Provides technical support from the Nez Perce Tribe in subbasin plans, project development, and coordination with tribal priorities for restoration activities.**
5520900	**Wallowa/Nez Perce Salmon Habitat Recovery Plan Implementation**	**To aid with implementation of the Wallowa County-Nez Perce Tribe Salmon Recovery Plan.**
9202604	**Spring Chinook Early Life History**	**Provides critical information to the GRMWP in understanding how the system is being used by spring chinook, allowing better focus with our restoration efforts in the Grande Ronde Basin.**
5519100	**Meadow Creek Instream Structure and Riparian Evaluation**	**Monitoring of past efforts and adaptive management in action.**

Section 4. Objectives, tasks and schedules

Objectives and tasks

Obj 1,2, 3	Objective	Task a,b,c	Task
1	Improve fish passage	a	Irrigation diversion improvement/modification
		b	Instream weir installation
		c	Fish ladder installation
		d	Road stream crossing improvements
2	Improve instream habitat diversity	a	Large woody debris additions
		b	Structure placement-rock,log
3	Enhance riparian condition (vegetation, function, etc.)	A	Riparian livestock exclusion fencing
		b	Grazing system modification
		c	Off-stream livestock water development
		d	Vegetation planting,seeding
		e	Road closure, obliteration
4	Increase streambank stability	a	Vegetation planting, seeding
		b	Structure placement-rock
		c	Riparian livestock exclusion fencing
		d	Off-stream livestock water development
5	Protect spawning habitat	a	Riparian livestock exclusion fencing
		b	Off-stream livestock water development
6	Improve upland habitats	a	Vegetation management-prescribed burning
7	Improve water quality - chemical (pH, nutrient load)	a	Riparian livestock exclusion fencing
		b	Off-stream livestock water development
8	Improve water quality - sediment reduction	a	Road closure, obliteration
		b	Vegetation planting, seeding
		c	Riparian livestock exclusion fencing
		c	Road drainage improvement
		c	Sediment trap

9	Improve water quality - temperature enhancement	a	Riparian livestock exclusion fencing
		b	Vegetation planting, seeding
		c	Large woody debris additions
		d	Structure placement-rock
		e	Road closure, obliteration

These objectives and tasks address habitat deficiencies identified in the technical document "Application of the Ecosystem Diagnosis & Treatment Method to the Grande Ronde Model Watershed Project", January 1997; L. Mobrand, L. Lestelle, Mobrand Biometrics, Vashon Island, WA; BPA #94AM33243

Deficiencies are listed by stream system in this document under section 7.a. Technical and/or scientific background.

Objective schedules and costs

Objective #	Start Date mm/yyyy	End Date mm/yyyy	Cost %
1	05/1998	12/1998	5%
2	05/1998	12/1998	15%
3	05/1998	12/1998	25%
4	05/1998	12/1998	10%
5	05/1998	12/1998	5%
6	05/1998	12/1998	5%
7	05/1998	12/1998	5%
8	05/1998	12/1998	15%
9	05/1998	12/1998	15%

Schedule constraints.

None known.

Completion date.

The completion date for the overall project (proposal # 9402700) is undetermined but will continue as long as there are habitat restoration needs in the Grande Ronde Basin, there are willing cooperators, and there is available funding. Individual restoration projects developed under this proposal are planned to be completed during the 1998 field season, normally May through December.

Section 5. Budget

Item	Note	FY98
Personnel		0
Fringe benefits		0
Supplies, materials, non-expendable property		0
Operations & maintenance		0
Capital acquisitions or improvements (e.g. land, buildings, major equip.)		0
PIT tags	# of tags:	0
Travel		0
Indirect costs		0
Subcontracts		* $863,000
Other		
TOTAL		* $863,000

* This proposal request is for approximately 40 individual habitat restoration projects. A project proposal will be prepared for each habitat restoration project which will identify work and budget items. Work and budget items will become a statement of work which is included in a contract between BPA and a subcontractor. Subcontractors could be Soil and Water Conservation Districts or other government agencies. Within the subcontract, funds normally go to materials or labor to do the on-the-ground habitat restoration work.

Outyear costs

Outyear costs	FY1999	FY00	FY01	FY02
Total budget	$950,000	$800,000	$800,000	$700,000
O&M as % of total	*	*	*	*

* O & M is the responsibility of landowners as part of their cost share for the project.

Section 6. Abstract

Type here (provide answers in paragraph form)

The Grande Ronde Basin was selected in 1992 by the Northwest Power Planning Council as the model watershed project in Oregon. The mission of the Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program (GRMWP) is to "develop and oversee the implementation, maintenance, and monitoring of coordinated resource management that will enhance the natural resources of the Grande Ronde River Basin."

This proposal will implement up to 40 individual habitat restoration projects under the Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program. Restoration projects will target specific habitat problems on critical stream reaches or habitats within the Grande Ronde Basin. Projects will make incremental habitat improvements toward desired conditions within the Basin. Habitat protection and restoration is one of the critical links to improving anadromous fish populations in the Columbia River Basin.

Projects developed for this proposal will address habitat parameters and management activities identified in the 1994 Fish and Wildlife Program (FWP), Section 7.6D.

Projects include a variety of work methods addressing the tasks listed in Section 4 of this document. The approach and methods for any given restoration project are individually developed using available technical expertise and landowner objectives.

Restoration project development follows a structured process which focuses limited resources to streams and locations where habitat benefits can be optimized. Projects undergo a thorough internal review process by the GRMWP Technical Committee and Board of Directors to assure implementation of priority restoration projects.

Monitoring is an essential component of the GRMWP process. Implementation and effectiveness monitoring is incorporated into the development of all restoration projects. The GRMWP has also implemented a basin-wide monitoring strategy in cooperation with the Union and Wallowa SWCD's. This program collects, summarizes and prepares monitoring data from the entire basin.

Section 7. Project description

a. Technical and/or scientific background.

The Grande Ronde Basin has been targeted for habitat restoration work for several years by various agencies and programs. In 1992 the Grande Ronde Basin was selected by the Northwest Power Planning Council as the model watershed project in Oregon. The mission of the Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program (GRMWP) is to "develop and oversee the implementation, maintenance, and monitoring of coordinated resource management that will enhance the natural resources of the Grande Ronde River Basin."

Habitat degradation within the Grande Ronde Basin has been well documented in reports commissioned by the GRMWP, graduate theses, as well as a multitude of other reports and publications. Technical reports commissioned by the GRMWP include the "GRMWP Action Plan", "Stream and Riparian Conditions in the Grande Ronde Basin" (Huntington, 1993), and "Application of the Ecosystem Diagnosis and

Treatment Method to the Grande Ronde Model Watershed Project" (GREDT) (Mobrand 1997). Three Watershed Action Plans and several Coordinated Resource Management Plans (CRMP's) have been completed or are in progress to address individual watersheds.

GRMWP habitat projects are predicated upon the assumption that habitat degradation in the Grande Ronde Basin has been a contributing factor to the decline of anadramous fish populations in the Grande Ronde Basin. This project addresses habitat deficiencies within the Basin by taking a comprehensive ridgetop-to-ridgetop restoration approach.

Individual projects included in this proposal will address habitat parameters and management activities identified in the 1994 Fish and Wildlife Program (FWP), Section 7.6D. These include:

sediment	bank stability	water quality	large woody debris
large pools	riparian vegetation	stream morphology	land management
roads	grazing	agricultural practices	recreation management

The project could include up to 40 individual projects each targeting specific habitat problems on critical stream reaches or habitats within the Basin. Projects will make incremental habitat improvements toward desired conditions within the Grande Ronde Basin. Habitat protection and restoration is just one of the critical links to improving anadromous fish populations in the Columbia River Basin.

Habitat deficiencies identified by the Ecoystem Diagnosis & Treatment Project by stream system are:

Stream Reach Range: **Grande Ronde River**

The capability of the mainstem Grande Ronde River of supporting spring chinook productivity (survival) is greatly reduced for most life stages compared to historic conditions. This reduction has been most severe within the Grande Ronde valley and continues for most of the distance upstream. Survival conditions have also declined markedly downstream of the valley reaches, although historic conditions there were naturally poor for some life stages in the lower 50 miles.

Survival conditions have changed in these reaches due primarily to increased water temperature, increased sediment load, loss in habitat diversity, changes in flow patterns, channel and bank destabilization, and alteration of the riparian zone.

Stream Reach Range: **Chesnimnus Creek**

Although this reach range's capability of supporting spring chinook productivity (survival) has been reduced substantially over the past 150 years, conditions have never been favorable for this species. In particular, survival conditions for

prespawning adults, spawners, and eggs have always been poor within Chesnimnus Creek, Joseph Creek, and downstream in the Grande Ronde River. These stream sections have apparently always had water temperature too high for good survival during these life stages.

Conditions for survival have worsened for the Patient because of changes that have occurred to channel stability, flow patterns, sediment load, habitat diversity, and predation levels.

Stream Reach Range: **Wallowa River**

The capability of the mainstem Wallowa River of supporting spring chinook productivity (survival) is sharply reduced compared to historic conditions for several life stages. Historically, all but approximately the lower 15 miles of this river had conditions for spring chinook survival that were likely the best in the entire Grande Ronde basin. This was due to moderating effects of Wallowa Lake on environmental attributes that topically increase mortality in streams not influenced by large lakes. Currently, conditions for survival during egg incubation, fry colonization, and early summer rearing are poorest high in the system, with conditions tending to improve downstream. Survival conditions have been worsened due to alterations in most environmental attributes, most notably, sediment load, nutrient load, and habitat diversity.

Stream Reach Range: **Bear Creek**

The capability of the lower six miles of Bear Creek of supporting spring chinook productivity (survival) is greatly reduced compared to historic conditions for most life stages. Survival conditions in this section are poorer due primarily to alterations in flow patterns, although other attributes (e.g., habitat diversity and temperature regimes) have also been affected. Historically, survival conditions were excellent for much of Bear Creek, and especially in the lower reaches of the stream. Changes in upper portions of the stream are comparatively minor.

Stream Reach Range: **Lostine River**

The capability of the lower 15 miles of mainstem Lostine River of supporting spring chinook productivity (survival) is substantially reduced compared to historic conditions for most life stages. Survival conditions in this section are poorer due primarily to higher summer temperatures, alterations in flow regimes, and loss of habitat diversity; other attributes have changed also. Historically, survival conditions were excellent in the lower ten miles; historic conditions worsened in an upstream

direction with increasing stream gradient and elevation. Changes in the upper ten miles are comparatively minor.

Stream Reach Range: **Hurricane Creek**

The capability of Hurricane Creek of supporting spring chinook productivity (survival) is greatly reduced compared to historic conditions for every life stage except smolt. Survival conditions are worst in the upper half of the stream (upstream of Lower Alderslope Ditch). Current survival potential in this reach in mid to late summer is essentially zero due to dewatering of the channel. Survival conditions in Hurricane Creek are poor due to alterations in flow regimes, habitat diversity, sediment load, channel stability, and temperature regimes. Historically, survival conditions were excellent for the lower half of the stream, with conditions worsening with increasing gradient.

Stream Reach Range: **Prairie Creek**

The capability of Prairie Creek of supporting spring chinook productivity (survival) compared to historic conditions differs by life stage and stream reach. In general, historic survival conditions in the lower portion of Prairie Creek were excellent for all life stages, but worsened rapidly as distance increased from the Wallowa River due to the stream's very small size. Lack of flow was the primary environmental constraint on productivity prior to the construction of the irrigation system. Survival conditions currently are good for some life stages throughout the stream, but are poor for egg incubation. The two attributes most affecting conditions currently are sediment load and habitat diversity.

Stream Reach Range: **Lookingglass Creek**

The capability of Lookingglass Creek of supporting spring chinook productivity (survival) is largely unchanged compared to historic conditions for all life stages.

Stream Reach Range: **Catherine Creek**

The capability of Catherine Creek of supporting spring chinook productivity (survival) is sharply reduced compared to historic conditions for nearly every life stage. This reduction has been most severe in the lower 40 miles of stream, with conditions improving in the upper stream reaches. Survival conditions approach historic levels for some life stages in the Catherine Creek forks. Survival conditions are especially

low in the later phase of the prespawning stage and in the lower 30 miles of stream. Survival conditions have declined in these reaches due primarily to increased water temperature, increased sediment load, loss in habitat diversity, loss in flow, channel and bank destabilization, and alteration of the riparian corridor.

Stream Reach Range: **Sheep Creek**

The capability of Sheep Creek of supporting spring chinook productivity (survival) is sharply reduced compared to historic conditions for nearly every life stage. Survival conditions are especially low in the later phase of the prespawning stage and in the spawning stage. Conditions are also relatively poor in the fry colonization, summer rearing, and overwintering stages. Survival conditions have declined in these reaches due primarily to increased water temperature, increased sediment load, loss in habitat diversity, changes in flow patterns, and alteration of the riparian corridor. Historic survival conditions in this stream were excellent.

Stream Reach Range: **Imnaha River**

The capability of the mainstem Imnaha River and its South Fork of supporting spring chinook productivity (survival) is reduced for several life stages compared to historic conditions. This reduction has occurred mainly in the mid to lower reaches of the river in the prespawning, spawning, fry colonization, and summer rearing life stages. In these reaches, survival conditions have worsened due to slightly increased water temperatures, small loss in habitat diversity, and increased channel (streambed) instability.

Stream Reach Range: **Big Sheep Creek**

The capability of the lower 23 miles of Big Sheep Creek of supporting spring chinook productivity (survival) is greatly reduced compared to historic conditions for most life stages. Survival conditions in this section have declined due primarily to changes in water temperature regimes, channel stability, habitat diversity, and to a lesser extent, flow regimes and sediment load. Historically, survival conditions in the lower portion of this section were relatively poor in the prespawner, spawner, and egg incubation stages. Survival conditions in the upper ten miles of the stream, though slightly depressed compared to historic conditions, remain relatively good.

Stream Reach Range: **Little Sheep Creek**

The capability of Little Sheep Creek of supporting spring chinook productivity (survival) is greatly reduced compared to historic conditions for all life stages except

smolt. Current survival conditions are generally poor due primarily to changes in flow regimes, channel (streambed) stability, sediment load, and habitat diversity. Historically, survival conditions in this stream were excellent for all life stages.

Stream Reach Range: **Lightning Creek**

The capability of Lightning Creek of supporting spring chinook productivity (survival) is essentially unchanged compared to historic conditions. In general, survival conditions are relatively poor for prespawners, spawners, and egg incubation but are good for summer rearing and overwintering.

b. Proposal objectives.

Type here (provide answers in paragraph form)

This proposal could include up to 40 individual habitat restoration projects. Each project will have proposal prepared which will identify specific objectives, benefits, tasks, costs, etc. Objectives cover a wide range of habitat parameters and will be specific to individual projects. Objectives may include the following:

1. Improve fish passage
2. Improve instream habitat diversity
3. Enhance riparian condition (vegetation, function, etc.)
4. Stabilize streambanks
5. Protect spawning habitat
6. Improve upland habitats
7. Improve water quality - chemical (pH, nutrient load, chemical)
8. Improve water quality - sediment reduction
9. Improve water quality - temperature enhancement

Proposed 1998 projects address freshwater habitat deficiencies identified in technical material and assessments that have been prepared for the Grande Ronde Basin. Listing of the Snake River spring chinook as threatened in 1992, and subsequent listing as endangered, is a testimonial to the serious nature of the habitat problems in the Grande Ronde Basin. Summer steelhead have been listed in 1997.

Products and improvements resulting from the individual projects are many and varied and will be identified when projects are fully developed (project proposals are due to the GRMWP by January 16, 1998). Individual project proposals will identify specific activities and tasks of the project. The project proposal is submitted to BPA and becomes the statement of work for the contract between BPA and the entity implementing the project.

The GRMWP will maintain an individual project file for each of the estimated 40 projects in this proposal. The project file will contain final project completion reports, photo-point pictures, annual monitoring reports as well as any other information pertinent to assessing the success of the project. The GRMWP also maintains a database which includes all restoration projects that have been implemented through the program.

c. Rationale and significance to Regional Programs.

Type here (provide answers in paragraph form)

The proposed project (an estimated 40 individual projects) addresses the protection or restoration of freshwater habitat within the Grande Ronde Basin. The habitat in the Grande Ronde Basin is but one element affecting anadramous fish populations in the Columbia Basin. Many other factors such as mainstem Snake and Columbia River habitat conditions, off-shore conditions, annual precipitation, harvest levels, and hydro-power generation operations all are elements of the FWP to improve Columbia Basin fish populations.

Habitat degradation in the Grande Ronde Basin resulting from man's activities has been occurring for well over a hundred years. Reduced in-basin habitat productivity as well as the many other out-of-basin impacts has seriously reduced anadramous fish populations from historical levels. The impacts are cumulative, and when all taken together have had dramatic effects on the populations. "Life history pathways associated with spawning reaches in the upper Grande Ronde River show severe declines in potential salmon performance compared to historic levels. Restoration potential is significant for this subbasin.... groups of fish using these pathways appear to be at extremely high risk of extinction" (GREDT, 1997).

Protection and restoration of the headwater habitats is critical to the reestablishment of wild fish populations. Emphasis on headwater habitat improvement should be a very high priority because it is a factor which we can influence, and because the time frame for improvements to be reflected in actual changes in habitat parameters is so long term.

Other BPA funded projects relevant to this project (in addition to those listed in Section 3) include:

Project #	Title	Sponsor
9703400	Monitoring Fine Sediment Levels-- Grande	CRITFC

	Ronde & John Day	
8402500	Grande Ronde Habitat-Enhancement Implementation/O&M	ODFW
9306600	Oregon Fish Screens Project	ODFW
9604400	Grande Ronde Basin Spring Chinook Captive Broodstock Program	ODFW/NPT
9607700	Meadow Creek Restoration	USFS
9202601	Grande Ronde Model Watershed-Project Planning/Support	Wallowa SWCD
9608300	Grande Ronde Subbasin Watershed Restoration	CTUIR

Projects listed above have a direct relationship with this proposal in that they address habitat or fish stock issues *within* the Grande Ronde Basin. Additionally any project along the mainstem Columbia River which affects adult or juvenile fish migration, or survival, are dependent upon this project to maintain or improve fish production potential in the headwaters. Without habitat improvements in headwater areas to maintain wild fish production, there may be little need for mainstem Columbia passage and habitat projects.

The proposed project will leverage BPA funds to accomplish much more restoration work than could be accomplished with BPA funds alone. Since 1994 for every BPA dollar allocated to the Grande Ronde Basin, through the GRMWP, an additional $1.65 has been cost-shared by private landowners, private Corporations, or other government agencies. See table in Section 7.a. Funds contributed by other entities, for projects developed under *this* proposal in 1998 can be expected to be similar.

d. Project history

Type here (provide answers in paragraph form)

BPA has been working with agencies in the Grande Ronde Basin for many years. The Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program (GRMWP) was selected by the Northwest Power Planning Council as the model watershed project in Oregon in April/1992. This project began in 1994. Since 1995, 94 individual habitat restoration projects have been accomplished through this project. See attached project listing which shows individual project specifics, including project objectives, BPA costs and project cost-share from other entities.

The 94 projects, funded in part by BPA have addressed nearly every component of watershed health including: water quality, water quantity, in-stream habitat complexity, riparian condition, streambank stability, and fish passage. Many of the benefits of the projects are already evident, others will only accrue over longer time periods. Projects addressing passage problems, sediment inputs or flow deficiencies have demonstrated benefits immediately or in the short term. Others such as improvements in riparian vegetation, bank stability or stream temperatures will only become apparent with time.

Accomplishments and expenditures in previous years are:

Year	# of Projects	BPA $	Cost Share $
1995	11	$356,864	$1,619,269
1996	42	$762,107	$1,001,184
1997	41	$1,146,875	$1,085,106
		$2,265,846	$3,705,559

See the attached restoration project listing for 1994-1997.

The 94 projects implemented through the GRMWP with BPA funding were accomplished in cooperation with the following entities:

Union SWCD*	Wallowa SWCD*	U.S. Forest Service
Oregon DOT	Wallowa County PWD	Union County PWD
Boise Cascade Corp	City of Union	Union County
OR Dept of F&W	OR State Parks	

*Projects done in cooperation with SWCD's were implemented on over 40 individual landownerships.

Project implementation and effectiveness monitoring has been incorporated into all projects to assess results of the projects. Elements of individual project monitoring include a project completion final report, photo-point documentation, and annual monitoring reports for five years. This monitoring is a requirement for having a habitat restoration project approved by the GRMWP and submitted to BPA for funding.

The GRMWP has implemented a basin-wide monitoring strategy in cooperation with the Union and Wallowa SWCD's to assess long-term results. The program collects, summarizes and prepares an annual report on all known monitoring being done in the basin. Data gaps have been identified and monitoring sites established to complete the data collection. This program will provide the data to assess long term habitat changes as a result of habitat restoration projects.

Knowledge will be gained over the next several years through project effectiveness monitoring and through the watershed and basin-wide habitat monitoring. Past

project development has combined state-of-the-art techniques with landowner management objectives. Current and future project development will build off of the implementation and effectiveness monitoring to incorporate those practices which provide the most cost effective and beneficial habitat restoration.

Habitat restoration projects of the GRMWP have produced other intangible results which although not on-the-ground are nevertheless crucial to future restoration efforts in the Grande Ronde Basin. The visible on-the-ground successes of the 94 past projects have demonstrated to landowners, residents and others that habitat restoration is working and can be done along with other resource uses. Many cooperative relationships with landowners have been developed which has created the potential for many more future projects. Successful projects and satisfied landowners are the best testimonial to good watershed stewardship and the greatest incentive for other landowners to get involved.

e. Methods.

Type here (provide answers in paragraph form)

This project are part of a comprehensive watershed restoration program now in its fourth year with the GRMWP. Approximately 40 individual restoration projects will be developed under this proposal. These projects, when implemented, will continue to restore riparian habitats and watershed function essential to the continued survival of wild spring chinook salmon and steelhead in the Grande Ronde Basin. Projects will address the full array of habitat deficiencies identified in planning documents listed Section 7.a.

The GRMWP staff, technical committee and Board of Directors annually solicit for projects through a variety of outreach programs with the SWCD's, landowner groups, government agencies and individuals. Project proposals for individual restoration projects are prepared by project proponents with assistance from GRMWP staff. Proposals identify objectives, habitat problems, tasks, benefits and budget needs specific to the project. Work and budget items will become a statement of work which is included in a contract between BPA and a subcontractor.

Projects undergo a thorough internal review process by the GRMWP Technical Committee and Board of Directors to assure implementation of priority restoration projects. Project review includes a screening and prioritization process which addresses biological, technical, economic and social merits of each project.

Projects include a variety of work methods addressing the tasks listed in Section 4. The approach and methods for any given restoration project are individually developed using available technical expertise and landowner objectives. In general, preferred methods of accomplishing given restoration objectives are to allow, or to encourage natural processes to do most of the restoration work over time.

Each of the individual projects, under the scope of this proposal, will have a monitoring plan. The plan will describe monitoring activities necessary to define habitat changes. A final report will be prepared for individual projects. Annual monitoring reports will be completed for a minimum of five years.

Operation and maintenance of GRMWP habitat restoration projects is the responsibility of project cooperators, usually landowners or resource management agencies. O & M will involve maintenance of improvements, annual reporting, monitoring, and operation as specified in individual project proposals (statement of work). Operation and maintenance will continue for the time period specified in the project proposal.

There are many uncertainties with habitat restoration work in the Grande Ronde Basin which could affect success of habitat restoration efforts. Biological systems are exceedingly complex and often will not respond in predictable ways due to the multitudes of variables in natural systems. Climatological events are not at all predictable and could nullify or negate some actions. Rain on snow events, ice flows and drought are examples of such events. These are risks that we attempt to minimize through comprehensive project planning and design based on state-of-the-art restoration techniques.

f. Facilities and equipment.

Type here (provide answers in paragraph form)

Individual habitat restoration projects included in this proposal are concurrently being developed by project proponents. Precise equipment needs are not known.

GRMWP restoration projects do not normally include the use of large facilities or the purchase of high cost equipment . However, equipment owned by project cooperators such as computers, vehicles, survey equipment and construction equipment is often used in project implementation. Most often use of the equipment is included in the cooperator cost share for the project. When equipment not available to cooperators (heavy construction equipment) is needed, it may be subcontracted and costs for this may be requested in project proposals.

g. References.

Type here (provide answers in paragraph form)

Stream & Riparian Conditions in the Grande Ronde Basin, Clearwater BioStudies, Inc., 1993, Charles W. Huntington, 23252 S. Central Point Rd., Canby, OR 97013

GRMWP Operations/Action Plan, May 1994; Dr. David Duncan & Dr. George Cawthon, PNW Region, Bureau of Reclamation, Boise, ID

Wallowa County-Nez Perce Tribe Salmon Recovery Plan, August 1993; Citizens of Wallowa; Wallowa County Court, Enterprise, OR

Application of the Ecosystem Diagnosis & Treatment Method to the Grande Ronde Model Watershed Project, January 1997; L. Mobrand, L. Lestelle, Mobrand Biometrics, Vashon Island, WA; BPA #94AM33243

Grande Ronde Basin Water Quality Monitoring, 1997; Dr. K. Diebel, Union Soil & Water Conservation District; Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program; Wallowa Soil & Water Conservation District

Section 8. Relationships to other projects

Type here (provide answers in paragraph form)

Sections 3 and 7.c of this document covered the relationships with other projects funded under the FWP. This discussion will address relationships not listed in those sections.

The GRMWP works very closely with most natural resource management and regulatory agencies in the Basin. The GRMWP also has direct ties to county and municipal governments. The most direct relationship is through the development of habitat restoration projects. These entities provide technical expertise to the GRMWP to help develop projects or to provide review of proposed projects. Individuals from the agencies serve on both the GRMWP Technical Committee and Board of Directors. Several of the agencies may also submit projects through the GRMWP to BPA for funding.

A strong symbiotic relationship developed in 1994 & 1995 between the Oregon Watershed Health Program (OWHP) and the GRMWP. The two entities cooperatively developed over 100 habitat restoration projects. OWHP committed over three million dollars to projects which was cost shared with nearly as much from local landowners and agencies. BPA cost shared in several of these projects.

The relationship between the GRMWP and landowners, through the SWCD's and other organizations, is a non-structured affiliation that is absolutely vital to the development of on-the-ground habitat restoration projects on private lands. Since 1994 over half of the 94 BPA projects, implemented through the GRMWP, have involved private landowners. This demonstrates an essential link between the entities promoting habitat restoration and the private lands where much of the work is needed.

Section 9. Key personnel

Type here (provide answers in paragraph form)

Patricia N. Perry, Executive Director, full-time (40 plus hours per week)
Lyle Kuchenbecker, Program Planner, full-time (40 plus hours per week)

PATRICIA N. PERRY

Experience:
U.S. Forest Service - Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program September 1992 - present
PNW Lab - Supervisor: Dr. Larry Hartmann (541) 962-6537. The Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program is an initiative of the Blue Mountains Natural Resources Institute located at the PNW Lab in La Grande, OR. Currently, I am on leave without pay from the Forest Service and employed by Eastern Oregon State College. Served as the Executive Director since November 1994; prior to being the Executive Director I was the Program Coordinator (Forest Service Position Description - Public Affairs Specialist GS-09). This has given me the opportunity to demonstrate skills in leadership ability, organization, coordination, and cooperation.

Responsibilities/tasks successfully completed include:

* Preparation of program work plans and budget in order to secure Bonneville Power Administration funding ($300,000 admin. annually; $1,100,000 project funds annually); briefing material and staff reports for Board of Directors; coordination of projects and activities with program subbasin groups
* Provided program briefings, tours, presentations, and panel discussions for Governor Kitzhaber, key legislators and legislative committees, various state agencies & their commissions, tribes, local organizations, private landowners and publics
* Development of effective communications and working relationships with key contacts/individuals involved in furthering program efforts; Organized public involvement activities, including technical training seminars (grazing) for landowners

In addition, program administration and other activities aside from those listed above have been continued. My fundamental understanding of natural resource issues and ability to work cooperatively with people of very diverse backgrounds has aided me in working with private landowners, program staff and committees, and other programs in discussing goals, objectives, and management strategies.

U.S. Forest Service April 1989 - August 1992

Kootenai National Forest, Fortine Ranger District - Kris Nixon, Supervisor (current telephone number 307-739-5500 Bridger-Teton N. F.) Business Management Assistant - supervised office staff (receptionist and time and attendance clerks) and was responsible for efficient functioning of the office; Purchasing Agent for the Ranger District - utilized third party drafts, credit cards, and managed imprest funds (purchasing authority could possibly be reinstated by Wallowa-Whitman N. F.); Accounting Clerk - tracked program manager costs utilizing NFC reports (i.e. monthly transaction registers, program manager statements, etc.), did accounting adjustments; Business Management Clerk - time and attendance reports and reception duties.

Port of Pend Oreille/Pend Oreille Valley Railroad - Asst. Manager for Traffic & Finance February 1985 - October 1985; Usk, Washington (509) 445-1090 - Supervisor - Jim Young & Board of Commissioners. Job required the ability to represent the Port District at public meetings; was responsible for all accounting activities, including complying with state audits and regulations for Port Districts; the ability to work well with a Board of Commissioners, customers, and the general public; a working knowledge of the railroad system; and the ability to use good judgement in making decisions quickly. Also supervised the train and track crews (approx. 12 people).

Education:
Spokane Falls Community College - May 1977, AAS - Business/Secretarial
Spokane, WA GPA 3.75; Related Training Courses & Conferences:
People Problems & How to Manage Them - Forest Service
Administrative Management - Forest Service
Small Purchasing, Advanced Small Purchasing, Imprest Fund training seminars (80 hours) - Forest Service
Budget & Finance Workshop - Forest Service
Fundamentals of Internet - GRMWP

Recent Awards:
1995, 1994, 1993 (4) - Certificates of Merit, Blue Mountains Natural Resources Institute, GRMWP
1992 - Certificate of Merit, USFS Fortine Ranger District
1991, 1990 - Certificate of Merit, USFS Eureka Ranger District

LYLE A. KUCHENBECKER
GRMWP PLANNER

Duties

Habitat Restoration Planning/Project Development
Design, process and collect information to conduct habitat restoration planning
Identify projects, prepare proposals, facilitate review and approval
Coordinate basin-wide monitoring activities
Prepare project Biological Assessments and other documentation

Technical Committee
Provides support to Technical Committee
Prepares program reports and documents, materials and meeting notes
Implements directives of the Technical Committee
Develops & acquires information for long-term project funding

Public Information
Participates in public information meetings
Prepares materials for presentation and presents materials
Prepares program support materials

Program Participation
Plans and organizes information for program activities
Attends Board meetings and interacts appropriately
Provides assistance t the Board as requested

Experience

U.S. Forest Service - Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program - February 1994 to present
Detail to the GRMWP - See above duties.

U.S. Forest Service - La Grande Ranger District, Wallowa-Whitman National Forest, NEPA Planner - September 1992 - February 1994
Ranger District Planning Staff
Responsible for all NEPA planning on the Ranger District

U.S. Forest Service - La Grande Ranger District, Wallowa-Whitman National Forest, INFORMS Project Leader - October 1990 - September 1992.
Special Demo project to test the feasibility of incorporating state-of-the-art GIS techniques into NEPA planning and analysis.

U.S. Forest Service - La Grande Ranger District, Wallowa-Whitman National Forest, District Silviculturist - October 1985 - October 1990

Administration of the District Silviculture Department which was responsible for all District silvicultural prescriptions, planting thinning and tree improvement programs.

U.S. Forest Service - Union Ranger District, Wallowa-Whitman National Forest, District Silviculturist - July 1980 - October 1985

Duties same as above.

U.S. Forest Service - Dale Ranger District, Umatilla National Forest.
U.S. Forest Service - Southern Forest & Range Experiment Station, New Orleans, La.

Special Qualifications

U.S. Forest Service - Region 6 Certified Silviculturist, 1981, 1985

Education

B.S. Forest Management University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point 1972
U.S. Forest Service - Silvicultural Institute, 1980

Section 10. Information/technology transfer

Type here (provide answers in paragraph form)

Well over 180 habitat restoration projects have been implemented throughout he GRMWP since 1994. Techniques have included almost every conceivable practice used in habitat restoration work. Most of the methods are tried and proven, some are not. Due to the intensity of activities in recent years the Grande Ronde Basin has functioned like a very large outdoor laboratory. The GRMWP has made provisions to incorporate the results of past and on-going projects into future projects.

A project file is maintained for each restoration project which includes an accomplishment report and all implementation and effectiveness monitoring done for the project. The GRMWP is building a sizable catalog of photo documentation (pre, during and post activity) and project data. GRMWP staff give many presentations annually within and outside of the basin to a variety of audiences at conferences, workshops and symposiums.

Technical information is often distributed informally through group, or one-on-one discussions with others doing similar work. This may occur through inquires or organized field trips.